



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/540,241	06/22/2005	Stephane Clauss	2002P01382WOUS	1614

46726 7590 05/12/2008  
BSH HOME APPLIANCES CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
100 BOSCH BOULEVARD  
NEW BERN, NC 28562

EXAMINER

BASICHAS, ALFRED

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3749

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/12/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/540,241

**Applicant(s)**

CLAUSS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Alfred Basichas

**Art Unit**

3749

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 15-31 and 33-36 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-31 and 33-36 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB06)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 15-19, 21, 26-33, and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Damrath (5,938,425), which shows all of the claimed limitations including, among other things,

A gas cooking apparatus, comprising: at least one gas burner 2; a control system 4 for adjusting the heat output of said gas burner; said control system including at least one control organ 41 arranged in a gas main 40 leading to said gas burner; said control system controls said control organ to adjust a gas throughput supplied to a burner nozzle of said gas burner; at least one secondary line 30 coupled to said burner nozzle in parallel to said control organ; said secondary line including an allocated shut-off organ 31 for opening and closing said secondary line; and said secondary line formed to have a flow resistance (42 or friction) which restricts the gas throughput in said secondary line, said flow resistance lower than a flow resistance formed by said burner nozzle (inherent that the fuel line is larger than the nozzle port(s), otherwise insufficient flow).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 15, including said secondary line flow resistance 42 which restricts said gas throughput is formed by the smallest transmission cross-section in said secondary line.

Art Unit: 3749

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 16, including said smallest transmission cross-section in said secondary line is larger than the transmission cross-section of said burner nozzle (inherent, otherwise insufficient fuel pressure at nozzle).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 16, including said secondary line is open at least when a maximum gas throughput is set (inherent to open secondary line when maximum fuel flow is desired).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 18, including said secondary line is closed when a partial gas throughput is set and said secondary line is only open when said maximum gas throughput is set (inherent that closing the secondary line will allow for minimum fuel flow to the burner).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 15, including said control system including a plurality of control organs, said control organs provided in a plurality of separate control lines branching off from said gas main and said control organs switched in parallel to one another (see at least fig. 1).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 21, including said control system is designed so that a plurality of part gas throughputs (Q.sub.1 to Q.sub.7) increase up to about sixty percent (60%) of a maximum gas throughput (Q.sub.8) in a substantially constant first increase (functional recitation of which the device shown by Damrath is capable of performing).

The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 26, including in a second increase said part gas throughputs (Q.sub.1 to Q.sub.7) increase from about sixty percent (60%) of said maximum gas throughput (Q.sub.8) to said maximum gas throughput (Q.sub.8) which is greater than said first increase (functional recitation of which the device shown by Damrath is capable of performing). The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 21, including when a maximum gas throughput (Q.sub.8) is set, said gas main, especially said control lines branching off from said gas main, are open (inherent that all the lines would be completely open to provide for maximum fuel flow).

A method for controlling a gas cooking apparatus including at least one gas burner, comprising: adjusting the heat output of the gas burner; providing at least one control organ arranged in a gas main leading to said gas burner; controlling said control organ to adjust a gas throughput and supplying said gas throughput to a burner nozzle of said gas burner; coupling at least one

secondary line to said burner nozzle in parallel to said control organ; said secondary line including an allocated shut-off organ for opening and closing said secondary line; and forming said

Art Unit: 3749

secondary line to have a flow resistance which restricts the gas throughput in said secondary line, said flow resistance lower than a flow resistance formed by said burner nozzle (see at least above).

The method according to claim 29, including forming said secondary line flow resistance which restricts said gas throughput by the smallest transmission cross-section in said secondary line (see at least above).

The method according to claim 30, including forming said smallest transmission cross-section in said secondary line larger than the transmission cross-section of said burner nozzle (see at least above).

The method according to claim 29, including opening said secondary line at least when a maximum gas throughput is set (see at least above).

The method according to claim 32, including closing said secondary line when a partial gas throughput is set and only opening said secondary when said maximum gas throughput is set (see at least above).

**New claim 36 recites a method claim including practically the same limitations as claims 15 and 29. Accordingly, claim 36 is anticipated as shown above.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Art Unit: 3749

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
6. Claims 20, 34, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damrath (5938425), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations. Damrath does not specifically recite:
20. The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 15, including said shut-off organ for opening and closing said secondary line is constructed as an unthrottled control valve.
34. The method according to claim 29, including forming said shut-off organ for opening and closing said secondary line as an unthrottled control valve.

The specific type of valve recited in the claims is an obvious modification based on design choice, and depends on availability and cost. In view of the absence of criticality for this particular design, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate it into the invention disclosed by Damrath, so as to provide for availability and cost. In addition, Official Notice is given that an unthrottled

control valve is old and well known in the art. Such an arrangement has the clear and obvious benefit of providing for effective fluid control. Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the claimed valve into the invention disclosed by Damrath, so as to provide for effective fluid control.

7. Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Damrath (5938425), which discloses substantially all of the claimed limitations.

Damrath does not specifically recite:

22. The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 21, including said control lines and said secondary line are constructed in a common housing.

23. The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 21, including said control and said secondary lines each have a mounting opening in said common housing for inserting said control organs.

24. The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 23, including said mounting opening of said secondary line is closed, possibly by a closure element (61).

25. The gas cooking apparatus according to claim 24, including said mounting opening of said secondary line is closed by a closure element.

The claimed housing design is an obvious modification based on design choice, and depends on spatial considerations. In view of the absence of criticality for this particular design, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate it into the invention disclosed by Damrath, so as to provide for spatial considerations.

***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicants' arguments with regard to the rejected claims, filed March 24, 2008, have been considered, but are not deemed persuasive.

a. Applicant's sole arguments asserts that Damrath fails to teach the claimed invention because there is no teaching or disclosure of a primary line having a flow resistance greater than a flow resistance formed by the burner nozzle. However, applicants are mistaken as it is clearly recited that the valves can restrict flow to a variety of flow resistance grades, including shutting off (see at least col. 8, lines 40-50). **Note: Applicant's argument appears to be identical to that asserted in the previous response of December 3, 2007. Applicant failed to address the examiner's position that the valves satisfy the "greater flow resistance" limitation.**

b. The examiner's assertion of Official Notice is taken to be admitted prior art in view of applicants' non-traversal of the assertion. MPEP 2144.03. The examiner appreciates applicants' waiver and efforts to expedite prosecution of the instant invention by avoiding unnecessary deliberations of well known aspects of the art.

***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP



§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alfred Basichas whose telephone number is 571 272 4871. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday during regular business hours.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center telephone number is 571 272 3700.  
May 13, 2008

/Alfred Basichas/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3749

**Application Number****Application/Control No.**

10/540,241

**Examiner**

Alfred Basichas

**Applicant(s)/Patent under  
Reexamination**

CLAUSS ET AL.

**Art Unit**

3749